

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6 * * *

7 AUDREY SPENCER,

Case No. 2:18-cv-02391-GMN-GWF

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

ORDER


10 SOUTHERN NEVADA REGIONAL
HOUSING AUTHORITY, *et al.*,

11 Defendants.
12

13 This matter is before the Court on the parties' Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order
14 (Submitted in Compliance with 26-1(b) (ECF No. 22), filed March 20, 2019. LR 26-1(a)
15 provides that "[i]f longer deadlines are proposed, the plan must state on its face "SPECIAL
16 SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED. Plans requesting special scheduling review must
17 include, in addition to the information required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) and LR 26-1(b), a
18 statement of the reasons why longer or different time periods should apply." The Defendant's
19 proposed discovery plan requests a 240-day discovery period but fails to set forth the reasons for
20 a discovery period in excess to 180 days. In addition, the Defendant's failed to state "SPECIAL
21 SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED" on the face of its pleading in bold type. Accordingly,

22 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that parties' Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order
23 (Submitted in Compliance with 26-1(b) (ECF No. 22) is **denied**, without prejudice.

24 Dated this 21st day of March, 2019.

25
26 
27 GEORGE FOLEY, JR.
28 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE